

S-E-C-R-E-T

INC-M-3  
6 June 1968

UNITED STATES INTELLIGENCE BOARD  
INTELLIGENCE INFORMATION HANDLING COMMITTEE

Minutes of Third Meeting, 29 May 1968

Members or Representatives Present

25X1

Chairman -  
DIA -  
CIA -  
NSA -  
State -  
  
Army -  
Navy -  
Air Force -  
FBI -  
AEC -  
Secretary -

--

Others Present

25X1

DIA -  
  
CIA -  
  
  
NPIC -  
AEC -  
NSF -  
Secret  
Service -  
  
DDR&E -  
INC/SS -

--

Part time

GROUP I  
Excluded from automatic  
downgrading and  
declassification

S-E-C-R-E-T

- 2 -

1. Approval of Minutes. Minutes of the Second IHC Meeting (IHC-M-2, 10 May 1968) were approved as circulated.

25X1

2. New Members. [redacted] was introduced as the AEC member of the IHC and [redacted] as probable AEC Alternate. [redacted] was introduced as Observer from Secret Service and [redacted] as his Alternate. [redacted] CIA, was introduced as a new member of the Support Staff.

25X

3. Organization and Functions of the IHC.

25X1

a. The Chairman reported that he had talked with the agencies which will furnish members of the Support Staff (State, NSA, DIA, & CIA) and it is expected that all of the new Staff will be on board by 8 July. Space for the staff has not been found in the CIA Headquarters Building yet, but hopefully this will be done soon. He indicated that he wants to work out a program of work for the Support Staff in order to prepare an answer to [redacted] most recent letter by 22 October. He feels that the new IHC is free to come up with whatever program/plan it believes best for the community and should not be rigidly bound by the PFIAB recommendations. In this connection, he feels that the best procedure is to start with the individual agency systems and plans and have them fit into a community-wide system.

25X1

b. [redacted] referred to his handout at the first IHC meeting (Attachment 4 to IHC-M-1, 1 May 1968, Initial Tasks of the IHC Support Staff) and said that he had "discovered" a list of problem areas drawn up in 1963 (see attachment to these Minutes) which he felt were still valid problems and more at the level at which the IHC should work rather than to have it work at some other level such as "define the problem". He proposed that this list be given to the full-time staff members and have them come up with a phased plan in early August for further management decision by the IHC.

c. The Chairman indicated that the problem is how exactly to task the Support Staff in order to come up with solutions that have not been reached in the past 18 years or so. After the week of 4 July he plans to sit down with the Support Staff and instruct them on what to do.

25X1

d. [redacted] stated that if we have a problem, we should get about the job of defining it. He felt that we have become obsessed with the information processing problem, which PFIAB has intensified, when the real objective is to develop intelligence, not just process information. He stated that we have been trying very hard for many years to come up with a community system but have not been able to do it. In the meantime we have done a great deal within each agency in furtherance of assigned government business to put together effective information

S-E-C-R-E-T

S-E-C-R-E-T

- 3 -

processing systems which, he feels, is probably the only way to do it. If it is true, as PFIAH seems to think, that we obtain more information than we can process effectively, the solution is to be more selective in our collection rather than to process all of the "trash" we obtain. He felt that if we had had an effective dialogue with Dr. Baker of PFIAH several years ago, we might not now be faced with the problem that PFIAH has presented. He felt further that it is time to find out to whom in the Executive Office we are writing. Obviously it is not the President and probably not even Mr. Rostow who signed the NSAM-163 and the subsequent memo.

25X1 e. [ ] commented that while the agencies may have been hard at work developing their own systems, they have not been working very hard to develop a community system. If they had done so, we might be much further along than we are today.

25X1 f. [ ] commented that people in high places do feel that we have problems, i.e., that we collect more than we can process effectively, and that we don't know what is already available. If they are wrong, we have to wrestle with the problem of changing their attitudes. He observed that joining of independently-developed agency systems into a community system will not be as easy as it sounds. DIA has not been greatly successful in this respect, although there have been some successes.

25X1 g. [ ] said he could not see why we should not be able to integrate the agency systems, but he felt that we must have a better understanding of just what the problem is as PFIAH sees it. He suggested that the JIRRG experience in complying with a White House directive might be helpful. He felt that if we could agree on some data bases and how they are to be organized and maintained, we would go a long way toward solving the apparent problem.

25X1 h. The Chairman, responding to the above comments, said that he had already scheduled a meeting with [ ] of JIRRG to review his experience. He also felt that he must meet with [ ] and probably [ ] to find out what they have in mind and to let them know what we think we should do. Other members agreed that this was the proper course. The Chairman indicated that he had already made a move in that direction and was now trying to arrange a meeting with [ ].

25X1 i. [ ] reviewed briefly the DCI response to NSAM-163 and the latest memorandum to the DCI signed by Mr. Rostow (USIN-D-71.1/2, 71 day). He indicated that the DCI's response to NSAM-163 was, in effect, that a community system would have to derive from the further development of the agencies' systems, that the DCI could not provide a phased plan at that time, that there were certain things that had to be done before he could develop a detailed plan, that this was going to take quite a bit of time, and that the DCI did not know yet how to do it.

S-E-C-R-E-T

- 4 -

25X1

The recent memo from [ ] said, in effect, that he was not accepting the DCI's judgement about the difficulty of developing a plan and that he wanted the DCI to come back by 22 October with what he said he could not give by 22 May, i.e., a detailed phased plan for a community system. [ ] felt that there were three alternative courses of action. The first is to tell [ ] again that we can't come up with a phased plan with costs and benefits and the other information he wants by 22 October. The second alternative is to go ahead and try to respond as requested. No one appears to have confidence that the job can be done properly by 22 October. It means doing all of the things in Annex A to the DCI's response to NSAM-368 between now and this summer when we will have to start to write to get the reply ready by 22 October. [ ] felt that this would be quite unrealistic. The third alternative would be to respond in generalities again as in the previous response, and to say again that we have many things to do before we can construct a phased plan.

25X1

[ ] pointed out that there is a notion in some quarters that what is now being done by the individual agencies can be done better on a community basis. Many of the people who feel that way have an exaggerated notion of the degree of duplication and inefficiency. Nor do they fully appreciate the need for each agency to do what it has to do in support of its own mission. He felt that the problem now is to identify in good faith those areas of common concern where community effort could really pay off and to preserve the right of each agency to do for itself what it feels it must do to meet its particular needs.

25X1

j. [ ] felt that it would be unrealistic to allow anyone including PFIAB to define a system that does not include the analysts without whom the so-called "system" would be only a processing machine. With the analyst included, it begins to look like a system.

25X1

k. [ ] pointed out that if plans, which had been developed in past years by the agencies as a result of addressing their own specific problems, had been implemented rather than being allowed to die, we would be much further ahead than we are today.

25X1

l. [ ] said he did not now see how the AEC could relate to the specific problem at hand.

25X1

m. [ ] said that the Secret Service gets a great deal of intelligence now from the USIB agencies and processes it in their own way to satisfy their needs. He felt that the White House probably does not understand how much interface there is already between agencies.

25X1

n. [ ] agreed essentially with [ ] comments above. He said that each agency has its own standards of

S-E-C-R-E-T

- 5 -

accuracy, timeliness. etc., and felt that the larger the system, the weaker its accuracy and responsiveness would be.

25X1

o. [ ] felt that while all of the agencies may be looking at their own peculiar problems as they understand them, they may, in fact, have a higher-level boss who is making the decisions and telling them what their systems should be like. He speculated that perhaps the real J-2 function is now at the White House level.

p. The Chairman expressed appreciation for the comments above and felt also that any system which is proposed must be based on the needs of the analysts for support.

4. COINS Management.

a. The Chairman indicated that the COINS management paper will probably be signed by the DCI very shortly and a copy will be sent to each member. [Note: Copy was sent to each member on 3 June]. He said that as a result of this paper he wants to develop a very close relationship with the COINS manager when he is appointed by NSA.

25X1

b. [ ] stated that NSA has not selected the manager yet.

25X1

c. [ ] inquired regarding the relationship between the COINS manager and the IHC. The Chairman stated that this relationship would be primarily through him as the representative of the DCI and Chairman of the IHC, and through a COINS Evaluation Panel and a COINS File Panel which will be established within the IHC structure.

d. The Chairman discussed the need of the IHC for a comprehensive briefing on COINS. It was agreed that such a briefing should be scheduled for early in August.

5. USIB File & Program Catalog System (FPCS). [ ] reported that the 1 May catalogs had been extracted from the FPCS data base and a 1 July distribution is planned. He reported that the CIA inputs were received too late to be included in their proper sequence in the index catalogs but will appear in addenda thereto. He said that DIA had found that the large size of some of the catalogs and the relatively small number of changes being sent in had made quarterly publication of the FPCS unrealistic. He suggested publication at six-month intervals as of 1 May and 1 November. The members agreed to this publication frequency. [ ] pointed out that the quarterly publication schedule was approved by USIB which also called for a

25X1

25X

S-E-C-R-E-T

S-E-C-R-E-T

- 6 -

comprehensive evaluation after one year of operation. It was agreed that a note should be sent to USIB informing them of the change to a semi-annual schedule.

6. NSA Workshop on Networks of Computers. [ ] reported that NSA is now formulating detailed plans and schedules with the names of participants, etc., for the subject workshop. He requested all who had not done so to furnish the names of suggested discussion leaders, participants, and additional topics to be covered as requested at the last IHC meeting. The Chairman stated that he planned to attend at least the first day and probably the last and hoped that all IHC members will also attend these general sessions. [ ] reminded the members of the limitation on full-time participants to 50 persons.

25X1 7. Security Briefing. The Chairman felt that all IHC members should have a briefing from [ ] an NSA consultant, regarding the security problems related to machine processing and transmission of data containing sensitive information. It was agreed that such a briefing would be arranged for either Monday, 15 July, or Thursday, 18 July, if possible. An attempt will be made to get a larger room so that others may also attend.

25X1 8. DIA Information Science Center. The Chairman reviewed DIA's year-long efforts to get approval of a GS-17 slot for the director of the Information Science Center. This has finally been disapproved and a GS-16 and two GS-15's have been approved. He suggested that nominations of qualified candidates for these jobs be furnished [ ]. He requested [ ] to set up a briefing for the IHC on the Center and the courses being planned. He indicated that the Center will look to this committee for guidance.

9. Information Science Training Report.

25X1 a. [ ] stated that it would be very expensive to provide the information requested for the upcoming training report. He felt that we should examine the requirement for some of the information called for and perhaps eliminate some of it. He felt that in this way the cost of providing what is necessary could be reduced by at least an order of magnitude. After much discussion it was agreed to postpone any further action until after the Subcommittee on Education and Training is organized and has had time to review what is required for the next training report.

10. Information Processing Standards Tech Memo. The following is extracted from the March 1968 issue of the IPS Tech Memo prepared by the Center for Computer Sciences and Technology of the National Bureau of Standards:

S-E-C-R-E-T

S-E-C-R-E-T

- 7 -

MAILING INFORMATION FOR IPS TECH MEMO

Those actively involved in Federal ADP programs qualify to receive IPS Tech Memo. If you are interested in receiving future issues of IPS TECH MEMO, please forward mailing information as follows --

NAME	AGENCY
TITLE & ORGANIZATION UNIT	NUMBER & STREET
ROOM & BUILDING	CITY, STATE, ZIP CODE

Please limit information to 25 characters per line; we must have your Zip Code; omit periods and commas. Mail to:

INFORMATION PROCESSING STANDARDS TECH MEMO  
Room B-264 Instrumentation Building  
Center for Computer Sciences and Technology  
National Bureau of Standards  
Washington, D. C. 20234



Executive Secretary

Attachment:  
Potential Areas of Improvement

S-E-C-R-E-T

S-E-C-R-E-T

IHC-M-3  
Attachment

#### POTENTIAL AREAS OF IMPROVEMENT

1. Improve ability to deliver potentially significant info in form useful for exploitation.
2. Develop additional tools for informing analysts of what info exists and where.
3. Develop methods for capturing results of individual analysis of given report or information.
4. Improve ad hoc response capability from automated info ref systems.
5. Develop standard item list.
6. Develop content control code and implement its use at publishers points.
7. Standardize item description elements and implement use.
8. Identify and publish list of coding tools showing which info elements are coded by each tool and by whom.
9. Develop common list of info elements from present files.
10. Develop standard info element identifications and start using these in report series having greatest impact.
11. Develop standard installation description format for use throughout community.
12. Promote development of standard photo storage and retrieval systems and formats.
13. Reduce multiple screening of items at many points in community.
14. Reduce dupe processing of foreign pubs; capture all pertinent info from foreign pubs. Make it available to analysts -- Propose foreign pubs ref center.
15. Complete identification and definition of intelligence community in terms of orgs. and systems to facilitate info Processing, communication and research.

S-E-C-R-E-T



S-E-C-R-E-T

- 2 -

16. Specification of I.P. problem in such specific terms that applied research can be directed toward the real and significant problems.
17. Screening criteria at hundreds of points in community not documented.
18. Lack of documentation on indexing and filing criteria in reference facilities.
19. In absence of clear-cut division of intel production responsibility, is it feasible to allocate info processing between agencies or components.
20. Lack of ability to test assertions such as cable reporting is seldom followed by hard copy.
21. Feasibility of using special common programming language for info proc.
22. Specification of variety of file conversion conditions to enable feasible techniques to be devised.
23. Develop effective way to integrate use of systems yet leave them organizationally separate.
24. Special survey and analysis of specific problem areas such as archiving, transliteration systems, etc.
25. Develop community requirements and specifications for specific I.P. techniques.
26. Development, testing, recommendation and monitoring of techniques.
27. Systems information library.
28. Community-oriented technical and operational feasibility review of I.P. R&D proposals and system changes.

S-E-C-R-E-T